

# Reasoning about concurrent loops and recursion with rely-guarantee rules

Ian J. Hayes<sup>1</sup>[0000-0003-3649-392X], Larissa A. Meinicke<sup>1</sup>[0000-0002-5272-820X],  
and Cliff B. Jones<sup>2</sup>[0000-0002-0038-6623]

<sup>1</sup> School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science,  
The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland 4072, Australia

<sup>2</sup> School of Computing, Newcastle University, UK

**Abstract.** The objective of this paper is to present general, mechanically verified, refinement rules for reasoning about recursive programs and while loops in the context of concurrency. Unlike many approaches to concurrency, we do not assume that expression evaluation is atomic. We make use of the rely-guarantee approach to concurrency that facilitates reasoning about interference from concurrent threads in a compositional manner. Recursive programs can be defined as fixed points over a lattice of commands and hence we develop laws for reasoning about fixed points. Loops can be defined in terms of fixed points and hence the laws for recursion can be applied to develop laws for loops.

## 1 Introduction


For sequential programs, the Hoare-style verification rule for a while loop [23,14],

$$\boxed{\text{while}} \frac{\{p \wedge b \wedge z = z_0\} c \{p \wedge z \ll z_0\}}{\{p\} \text{ while } b \text{ do } c \text{ od } \{p \wedge \neg b\}} \quad (1)$$

makes use of a loop invariant,  $p$ , that is assumed to hold initially and is maintained by the body of the loop if the loop guard  $b$  holds. To show termination, a variant expression  $z$  is required to strictly decrease on each iteration according to a well-founded relation  $\ll$ . The rule (1) is not valid if there are concurrent threads modifying shared variables because interference may (a) invalidate the invariant  $p$  or (b) increase the variant expression  $z$  or (c) interfere with the evaluation of  $b$  in such a way that  $b$  may not hold at the start of the execution of the loop body or (d)  $\neg b$  may not hold on exit from the loop.

Achieving a compositional rule that copes with interference proved challenging [9]. Rely/Guarantee conditions were presented in [24,25,26] in the keyword style of VDM [27]; a series of contributions recast the approach in an algebraic style [15,13,16,22,20].

When designing a thread  $T$ , it is assumed that all atomic state-to-state transitions made by its environment (i.e. concurrently running threads) satisfy a rely condition  $r$ , a relation between program states. To complement this, the implementation of thread  $T$  must ensure that all program transitions it makes satisfy a guarantee relation  $g$ , where  $g$  must imply the rely condition of every thread running in parallel with  $T$ . Fig. 1 gives an example of an Aczel trace of program and environment transitions [1,40,8]. The intricate question of which transitions are to be viewed as atomic is addressed in §3.



**Fig. 1.** An Aczel trace satisfying a specification with precondition  $p$ , postcondition  $q$ , rely condition  $r$  and guarantee condition  $g$ . If the initial state,  $\sigma_0$ , is in  $p$  and all environment transitions ( $\epsilon$ ) satisfy  $r$ , then all program transitions ( $\pi$ ) must satisfy  $g$  and the initial state  $\sigma_0$  must be related to the final state  $\sigma_7$  by the postcondition  $q$ , also a relation between states. The  $\checkmark$  at the right indicates a terminating trace.

**Example: removing an element from a set.** Consider the example of removing an element  $i$  from a small set  $w$  (that can be represented as a bit-map in a single machine word) in a context in which concurrent threads may not add elements to  $w$  but may remove elements (including  $i$ ) from  $w$ .<sup>3</sup> The transitions made by the environment satisfy the *rely* relation,  $\ulcorner *w' \subseteq *w \urcorner$ . Our theory uses binary relations between program states but in examples it is more convenient to use a predicate notation, in which unprimed variables refer to their value in the pre state and primed variables refer to their value in the post state. For such a predicate  $R$ ,  $\ulcorner R \urcorner$  is the corresponding relation. We explicitly dereference the variable  $w$  to get its value  $*w$ , where in most programming languages dereferencing is implicit. The *remove* operation (2) has a post-condition (also a relation) that  $i$  is no longer in  $*w$ ,  $\ulcorner i \notin *w' \urcorner$ . The *remove* operation needs to *guarantee* that it does not remove elements other than  $i$  and does not add any elements, that is, every program transition of *remove* must satisfy the relation,  $\ulcorner *w - *w' \subseteq \{i\} \wedge *w' \subseteq *w \urcorner$ . That gives the following specification for *remove*,

$$\lambda w i . \text{rely } \ulcorner *w' \subseteq *w \urcorner \mathbin{\text{\textcircled{\tiny M}}} \text{guar}_{\pi} \ulcorner *w - *w' \subseteq \{i\} \wedge *w' \subseteq *w \urcorner \mathbin{\text{\textcircled{\tiny M}}} (\ulcorner i \notin *w' \urcorner) \quad (2)$$

where the command **rely**  $r$  assumes that all environment transitions satisfy the rely relation  $r$  (25), the command **guar** $_{\pi}$   $g$  ensures that all program transitions satisfy the guarantee relation  $g$  (24), the command  $\langle q \rangle$  ensures the overall operation satisfies the relation  $q$  (32), and the weak conjunction operator  $\mathbin{\text{\textcircled{\tiny M}}}$  (defined in §2) combines these three commands to form a rely/guarantee specification. The parameter  $i$  is a constant parameter; constant parameters cannot be modified.<sup>4</sup> The parameter  $w$  is a reference parameter; to get the value of  $w$ , it needs to be dereferenced,  $*w$ .<sup>5</sup>

The following code (3) implements the *remove* operation making use of a compare-and-swap (CAS) instruction and a local variable *sample*, which is used to sample the

<sup>3</sup> This example is a sub-task of the development of a concurrent version of the ‘Sieve of Eratosthenes’ in [17]. In that problem the set of primes can be represented as a bit map represented as an array  $P$  of 64-bit words, where element  $P[j]$  represents the subset of primes between  $64 * j$  and  $64 * (j + 1) - 1$ . The *remove* operation treated here is suitable for removing an element from a single word in that array, where a single word represents a subset of 0..63.

<sup>4</sup> We have omitted giving the type invariants on  $w$  and  $i$  to simplify the presentation.

<sup>5</sup> Technically,  $w$  is also a constant parameter but it is an l-value and hence acts as a reference parameter.

current value of  $*w$ . The CAS instruction atomically checks whether the current value of  $*w$  is equal to  $*sample$  and if so, updates  $w$  to  $*sample - \{i\}$  but if  $*w$  is not equal to  $*sample$ , no change is made to  $w$ . A loop is required because interference may modify  $w$  between the point at which it is sampled and the point at which the CAS checks if  $*w$  equals  $*sample$ , leading to the CAS having no effect, i.e. it does not remove  $i$ . For the CAS instruction (4),  $lv$  is a reference parameter and  $old$  and  $new$  are constant parameters, and the command  $lv : \langle q \rangle$  represents an atomic specification command that changes only  $lv$  (29) and satisfies the relation  $q$  atomically (31). The fact that the CAS operates atomically is essential to the correctness of the *remove* operation.

$$\text{while } i \in *w \text{ do } sample := *w ; CAS(w, *sample, *sample - \{i\}) \text{ od} \quad (3)$$

$$CAS \triangleq \lambda lv \text{ old new } . lv : \langle (*lv = old \wedge *lv' = new) \vee (*lv \neq old \wedge *lv' = *lv) \rangle \quad (4)$$

In its concurrent context, the loop guard  $i \in *w$  in (3) may evaluate to true but, because interference may remove  $i$  from  $w$  just after the guard is evaluated,  $i \in *w$  may no longer hold at the start of the body of the loop. That means the sequential rule (1) is invalid and needs to be adapted to handle concurrency. If the guard evaluates to false, the condition  $i \notin *w$  is stable under interference that does not add elements to  $*w$ , and hence  $i \notin *w$  holds on loop termination.

To verify that a loop terminates, the sequential rule (1) uses a variant expression that the loop body must strictly decrease on each iteration according to some well-founded relation, however, in the context of concurrency, we need to guard against the interference increasing the variant expression, which would invalidate the termination argument. A suitable variant expression to show the loop (3) terminates is  $*w$  under the well founded order  $\subset$  on finite sets. The rely condition  $*w' \subseteq *w$  assumes the variant is not increased by interference from the environment.

A further subtlety exhibited by the *remove* example, is that it may be the interference that removes  $i$  just after the guard is evaluated, so that the CAS then has no effect. In this case the body of the loop does not decrease the variant (as required in the sequential verification rule (1)) but the loop will terminate because the loop guard will evaluate to false, and  $i \notin *w$  is stable under interference that does not add elements to  $*w$ . Our approach to this issue is to use an “early termination” version of the loop inference rule that requires that the loop body either decreases the variant or establishes a condition,  $p_X$ , that ensures the loop guard will evaluate to false and hence that the loop terminates. In the sequential case, an early termination version of the verification rule can be proven in terms of the standard rule by using a variant that is a pair of the guard and a variant,  $(b, z)$ , using lexicographical ordering [14]. That is not possible in the context of concurrency because it may be the interference from concurrent threads that decreases the variant, rather than the loop body. The concurrent version of the non-early termination rule can be proven as a special case of the early termination version.

**Fixed points and recursion.** The semantics of a while loop can be defined as the greatest<sup>6</sup> fixed point ( $\nu f$ ) of the monotone function,  $f \triangleq \lambda x . \text{if } b \text{ then } c ; x \text{ else } \tau \text{ fi}$ ,

<sup>6</sup> In other works on the refinement calculus [2,3], the dual lattice is used (i.e. with the reverse ordering), so greatest fixed points in our theory correspond to least fixed points in theirs.

where  $\tau$  is the null command (i.e. the identity of sequential composition). A greatest fixed point is used because that allows both a finite and an infinite number of iterations, and hence allows one to address termination of loops. A while loop is defined as follows, using the standard abbreviation  $(\nu x . f x)$  for  $\nu(\lambda x . f x)$ .

$$\text{while } b \text{ do } c \text{ od} \triangleq \nu x . \text{if } b \text{ then } c ; x \text{ else } \tau \text{ fi} \quad (5)$$

More generally, the semantics of a recursive function is defined as its greatest fixed point. Therefore we develop laws for reasoning about greatest fixed points of functions, which allows us to reason about recursive functions (§4) and hence while loops (§5), in the context of interference from concurrent threads. Significantly, unlike most other approaches [24,25,26,35,36,40,12,32,38,39,34,33], we assume neither expression evaluations nor assignment commands are executed atomically (see [19]).

## 2 Wide-spectrum language

This section introduces our wide-spectrum language that incorporates both specification and programming language commands [4]. Our approach follows that used for the sequential refinement calculus [2,30] but extends it with concurrency, which requires a richer semantics based on Aczel traces [1,40,8]. The underlying theory is based on our earlier research [15,13,16,22,20] and all lemmas and theorems have been proven in our corresponding Isabelle/HOL theories.

*Naming and syntactic precedence conventions.* We use  $\Sigma$  for the set of program states,  $\sigma$  for program states (i.e.  $\sigma \in \Sigma$ ),  $c$  and  $d$  for commands;  $p$  for sets of program states;  $g$ ,  $q$  and  $r$  for binary relations between program states;  $u$ ,  $v$  and  $w$  for program variables;  $e$  for expressions,  $b$  for boolean expressions, where  $\mathbb{B}$  is the set of booleans, and  $k$  and  $\kappa$  for values. Subscripted versions of the above names follow the same convention. Unary operations and function application have higher syntactic precedence than binary operations. For binary operations, non-deterministic choice ( $\vee$ ) has the lowest precedence, and sequential composition ( $;$ ) has the highest precedence, except framing ( $V : c$ ) is higher. We use parentheses to resolve all other syntactic ambiguities.

**Command lattice and primitive operations.** Our language consists of a complete lattice of commands with partial order,  $c \succeq d$ , meaning command  $c$  is refined (or implemented) by command  $d$ , so that non-deterministic choice ( $c \vee d$ ) is the lattice join. The lattice is complete so that, for a set of commands  $C$ , non-deterministic choice,  $\bigvee C$ , is defined as the least upper bound. The lattice operators  $\vee$  and  $\bigvee$  are considered part of our wide spectrum language.

**Aczel trace semantics.** The semantic model for the lattice of commands consists of sets of Aczel traces [1,9,8]. An Aczel trace consists of a possibly infinite sequence of state-to-state transitions each of which is labeled as either a program ( $\pi$ ) or environment ( $\epsilon$ ) transition, as in Fig. 1. A trace may be either terminating, aborting or incomplete. Sets of traces corresponding to commands are prefix closed (i.e. they contain all incomplete

prefix traces of a trace) and abort closed (i.e. they contain all possible extensions of an aborting trace). The language includes the following three binary operators:

- $c ; d$ , sequential composition, that is associative, has the null command,  $\tau$ , as its neutral element, and distributes arbitrary non-deterministic choices in its left argument and non-empty non-deterministic choices in its right argument. A trace of  $c ; d$  consists of the gluing concatenation of a terminating trace of  $c$  and a trace of  $d$ , or an incomplete (including infinite) or aborting trace of  $c$ . A *gluing concatenation* of a terminating trace  $tr_1$  with a trace  $tr_2$  requires that the final state of  $tr_1$  equals the initial state of  $tr_2$  and these two states become a single state in the concatenation.
- $c \parallel d$ , parallel composition, that is associative, commutative, and distributes non-empty non-deterministic choices in both its arguments. Because each trace records *both* the behaviour of the program *and* its environment, parallel composition is synchronous, and a trace of  $c \parallel d$  consists of a matching of a trace of  $c$  and a trace of  $d$ , where a program transition  $\sigma \xrightarrow{\pi} \sigma'$  of  $c$  matches an environment transition  $\sigma \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \sigma'$  of  $d$  to give  $\sigma \xrightarrow{\pi} \sigma'$  for  $c \parallel d$  (or vice versa) and an environment transition  $\sigma \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \sigma'$  for both  $c$  and  $d$  matches to give the same environment transition for  $c \parallel d$ . Note that a program transition of  $c$  cannot match a program transition of  $d$ , leading to the interleaving of their program transitions. If either  $c$  or  $d$  aborts, so does  $c \parallel d$ . Termination of  $c \parallel d$  corresponds to termination of both  $c$  and  $d$ .
- $c \mathbin{\text{\tiny \(\cap\)}} d$ , weak conjunction, that is associative, commutative, idempotent, and distributes non-empty non-deterministic choices in both its arguments. A trace of  $c \mathbin{\text{\tiny \(\cap\)}} d$  is either a trace of both  $c$  and  $d$ , or it is an aborting trace of  $c$  that equals an incomplete trace of  $d$  up to the point of abort of  $c$  (or vice versa). Weak conjunction ( $c \mathbin{\text{\tiny \(\cap\)}} d$ ) behaves as both  $c$  and  $d$  unless either  $c$  or  $d$  aborts, in which case the weak conjunction aborts. Termination of  $c \mathbin{\text{\tiny \(\cap\)}} d$  corresponds to termination of both  $c$  and  $d$ .

**Values, left values and states.** Our theory treats values, left values (variables and indexed array elements) and program states abstractly. For values ( $\in \textit{Value}$ ) the only constraint is that *Value* contains the distinct boolean values true and false (so that we can handle boolean guards in conditionals and loops). The left values (l-values for short) of our language consist of base variable names ( $v \in \textit{Identifier}$ ) and indexed array elements (*Indexed A i*), where  $A$  is an l-value and  $i$  is an index value.

$$\textit{LValue} \triangleq \textit{Base Identifier} \mid \textit{Indexed LValue Value} \quad (6)$$

We abbreviate “*Base v*” to “ $v$ ”, and “*Indexed A i*” to “ $A[i]$ ”. L-values could be extended to handle a heap but we do not consider that in this paper.<sup>7</sup> The set of possible program states,  $\Sigma$ , is a mapping from l-values to values.

$$\Sigma \triangleq \textit{LValue} \rightarrow \textit{Value} \quad (7)$$

<sup>7</sup> Because a heap corresponds to an anonymous array with indices being pointer values, the theory for handling arrays could be used to handle a heap.

**Primitive commands.** A command is infeasible in a state,  $\sigma$ , if it cannot make any transition from  $\sigma$  and it can neither terminate nor abort in state  $\sigma$ . The least command in our lattice,  $\perp$ , is everywhere infeasible. The language includes four primitive commands:

- $\tau p$  is an instantaneous test that the current state  $\sigma$  is in the set of states  $p$ : if  $\sigma \in p$ ,  $\tau p$  terminates, otherwise it is infeasible – note that there is no transition taken by an instantaneous test (in the trace semantics, its trace is tagged as terminated);
- $\pi r$  is an atomic program command that may perform a program transition  $\sigma \xrightarrow{\pi} \sigma'$  if  $(\sigma, \sigma') \in r$  and then terminate, otherwise it is infeasible if  $\sigma \notin \text{dom } r$ ;
- $\epsilon r$  is an atomic environment command that may perform an environment transition  $\sigma \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \sigma'$  if  $(\sigma, \sigma') \in r$  and then terminate, otherwise it is infeasible, and
- $\top$  is Dijkstra's abort command [10,11] that can do any behaviour whatsoever. It is the greatest command. Aborting behaviour is irrecoverable, (i.e.  $\top ; c = \top$  for any  $c$ ).

For tests,  $\tau p_1 \succeq \tau p_2$  if  $p_1 \supseteq p_2$ , and both  $\pi r_1 \succeq \pi r_2$  and  $\epsilon r_1 \succeq \epsilon r_2$  hold if  $r_1 \supseteq r_2$ . Tests/atomic commands are everywhere infeasible for the empty set/relation:  $\tau \emptyset = \pi \emptyset = \epsilon \emptyset = \perp$ . A command is considered *atomic* if it is of the form,  $\pi g \vee \epsilon r$ , for some relations  $g$  and  $r$ , that is, it can only make a single transition, which may be either a program ( $\pi$ ) transition in  $g$  or an environment ( $\epsilon$ ) transition in  $r$ .

The command  $\tau$  is the test that always succeeds (8). The assert command,  $\{p\}$ , aborts if the current state is not in  $p$ , otherwise it terminates immediately (9), where  $\bar{p} = \Sigma - p$ . Property (10) gives an alternative form for an assert command. Note that  $\{\emptyset\} = \top$  and  $\{\Sigma\} = \tau$ . The command  $\alpha r$  allows either a program or an environment transition, provided it satisfies  $r$  (11). The abbreviations  $\pi$  and  $\epsilon$  allow any program (13) or environment (14) transition, respectively, and  $\alpha$  allows any transition, program or environment (15), where  $\text{univ}$  is the universal relation between program states (12). Note the bold fonts for  $\tau$ ,  $\pi$ ,  $\epsilon$  and  $\alpha$ .

$$\tau \hat{=} \tau \Sigma \quad (8) \quad \text{univ} \hat{=} \Sigma \times \Sigma \quad (12)$$

$$\{p\} \hat{=} \tau \vee \tau \bar{p} ; \top \quad (9) \quad \pi \hat{=} \pi \text{univ} \quad (13)$$

$$\{p\} = \tau p \vee \tau \bar{p} ; \top \quad (10) \quad \epsilon \hat{=} \epsilon \text{univ} \quad (14)$$

$$\alpha r \hat{=} \pi r \vee \epsilon r \quad (11) \quad \alpha \hat{=} \alpha \text{univ} \quad (15)$$

Given a set of states  $p$  and a relation  $r$ ,  $r \triangleright p$  is the relation  $r$  restricted so that its range elements are within  $p$ .

$$r \triangleright p \hat{=} \{(\sigma, \sigma') \in r . \sigma' \in p\} \quad (16)$$

Two assertions can be merged (17). A test after an assertion with the same set of states is redundant (18). If  $c$  is refined by  $d$  from states in  $p_1$  and from states in  $p_2$ , then  $c$  is refined by  $d$  from states in their union (19), and that property can be generalised to a set of sets of states  $P$ , rather than just two sets of states (20).

$$\{p_1\} ; \{p_2\} = \{p_1 \cap p_2\} \quad (17)$$

$$\{p\} ; \tau p = \{p\} \quad (18)$$

$$\{p_1 \cup p_2\} ; c \succeq d \quad \text{if } \{p_1\} ; c \succeq d \text{ and } \{p_2\} ; c \succeq d \quad (19)$$

$$\{\bigcup P\} ; c \succeq d \quad \text{if } \forall p \in P . \{p\} ; c \succeq d \quad (20)$$

The inclusion of assertions makes it possible reason about Hoare triples.

**Definition 1 (Hoare-triple).** A command  $c$  establishes postcondition  $p_1$  from initial states satisfying  $p$ , written using the Hoare triple,  $\{p\} c \{p_1\}$ , if and only if,<sup>8</sup>

$$\{p\} ; c \succeq c ; \{p_1\}. \quad (21)$$

Note the different braces used in the assertion commands and for the pre and post conditions in the Hoare triple.

**Derived commands.** Finite ( $c^*$ ) and possibly infinite ( $c^\omega$ ) iteration of a command  $c$  zero or more times can be defined as the least (22) and greatest (23) fixed points, respectively, of the monotone function  $(\lambda x . \tau \vee c ; x)$ .

$$c^* \triangleq \mu x . \tau \vee c ; x \quad (22) \quad c^\omega \triangleq \nu x . \tau \vee c ; x \quad (23)$$

A program guarantee command,  $\text{guar}_\pi g$  requires that every program transition satisfies the relation  $g$  but places no constraints on environment transitions (24). A rely command,  $\text{rely } r$ , assumes environment transitions satisfy  $r$ ; if any environment transition does not, it aborts (25), in the same way that an assertion  $\{p\}$  aborts if the initial state is not in  $p$ . The notation  $\bar{r}$  stands for the complement of the relation  $r$ . The command **term** only performs a finite number of program transitions but does not constrain its environment (26). The command **idle** can perform only a finite number of stuttering (no change) program transitions but does not constrain its environment (27). The relation  $\text{id}$  is the identity relation and  $\text{id}_V$  is the identity relation on a set of l-values  $V$  (28), and  $\bar{V}$  is the set complement of  $V$ . The command  $V : c$ , restricts  $c$  so that its program transitions may only modify l-values in the set  $V$ , called its *frame* (29). Within identity relations and frames an l-value  $u$  stands for the singleton set  $\{u\}$ . The command **opt**  $r$  either performs a single program transition satisfying  $r$  or it can terminate immediately from states  $\sigma$  such that  $(\sigma, \sigma) \in r$  (30), that is,  $r$  is satisfied by not changing the state. The atomic specification command,  $\langle r \rangle$ , achieves  $r$  via an atomic program transition and allows finite stuttering program transitions (that do not change the state) and arbitrary environment transitions before and after the atomic transition (31); like **opt**  $r$ , the atomic transition satisfying  $r$  may be elided for states  $\sigma$  in which  $(\sigma, \sigma) \in r$ .

$$\text{guar}_\pi r \triangleq (\pi r \vee \epsilon)^\omega \quad (24) \quad \text{id}_V \triangleq \{(\sigma, \sigma) . \forall v \in V . \sigma' v = \sigma v\} \quad (28)$$

$$\text{rely } r \triangleq (\alpha \vee \epsilon \bar{r} ; \top)^\omega \quad (25) \quad V : c \triangleq \text{guar}_\pi \text{id}_{\bar{V}} \sqcap c \quad (29)$$

$$\text{term} \triangleq \alpha^* ; \epsilon^\omega \quad (26) \quad \text{opt } r \triangleq \pi r \vee \tau \{ \sigma . (\sigma, \sigma) \in r \} \quad (30)$$

$$\text{idle} \triangleq \text{guar}_\pi \text{id} \sqcap \text{term} \quad (27) \quad \langle r \rangle \triangleq \text{idle} ; \text{opt } r ; \text{idle} \quad (31)$$

The postcondition specification command,  $\langle q \rangle$ , for  $q$  a relation between states, guarantees to terminate in a final state  $\sigma'$  that is related to the initial state  $\sigma$  by  $q$  (32). The initial test,  $\tau\{\sigma\}$ , selects those behaviours that start in state  $\sigma$  and the final test,

<sup>8</sup> Note if  $c$  does not terminate or aborts, (21) holds because the assertion  $\{p_1\}$  is not reached, so this is a weak correctness interpretation of Hoare logic [37]. For our usages here,  $c$  is an expression evaluation, which can neither abort nor fail to terminate.

$\tau\{\sigma' . (\sigma, \sigma') \in q\}$ , restricts the behaviours to those satisfying  $q$  end-to-end. The non-deterministic choice accumulates those behaviours for all possible starting states  $\sigma$ .

$$\langle\!\langle q \rangle\!\rangle \hat{=} \bigvee_{\sigma} \tau\{\sigma\} ; \mathbf{term} ; \tau\{\sigma' . (\sigma, \sigma') \in q\} \quad (32)$$

If a specification command is restricted to achieve a final state satisfying  $p$ , that restriction may be pulled out as a test (33). The composition of binary relations is written,  $r_1 \circ r_2$ , where,  $(\sigma, \sigma') \in (r_1 \circ r_2)$  if and only if  $(\exists \sigma_1 . (\sigma, \sigma_1) \in r_1 \wedge (\sigma_1, \sigma') \in r_2)$ . A specification command  $\langle\!\langle r_1 \circ r_2 \rangle\!\rangle$  can be split into two specifications, where the first establishes the precondition  $p$  of the second (34). Relies distribute over sequential composition (35) [29].

$$\langle\!\langle q \triangleright p \rangle\!\rangle = \langle\!\langle q \rangle\!\rangle ; \tau p \quad (33)$$

$$\langle\!\langle r_1 \circ r_2 \rangle\!\rangle \succeq \langle\!\langle r_1 \triangleright p \rangle\!\rangle ; \langle\!\langle p \rangle\!\rangle ; \langle\!\langle r_2 \rangle\!\rangle \quad (34)$$

$$\mathbf{rely} r \mathbin{\frown} c_1 ; c_2 = (\mathbf{rely} r \mathbin{\frown} c_1) ; (\mathbf{rely} r \mathbin{\frown} c_2) \quad (35)$$

**Expressions.** Our treatment of expressions is based on that in [19] and the reader is referred there for more details. We distinguish between l-values expressions (*lve*) and expressions (*e*). The syntax of expressions includes constants ( $\kappa$ ), dereferencing of l-value expressions ( $*lve$ ), unary operators ( $\ominus e$ ), and binary operators ( $e_1 \oplus e_2$ ). L-value expressions consist of either a variable  $v$  or an indexed array reference  $lve[e]$ , in which  $lve$  is an l-value expression (thus allowing multi-dimensional arrays) and  $e$  is an index expression. The notation  $\llbracket e \rrbracket_{\sigma}$  stands for the value of expression  $e$  in state  $\sigma$ ; it has the standard inductive definition over the structure of expressions [19].

While in a sequential program the value of an expression is uniquely determined by the initial state in which it is evaluated, in a concurrent context its value depends on the sequence of states that occur during its evaluation. Hence for a given initial state, an expression may evaluate to different values depending on the interleaving environment transitions between its accesses to variable values. Our semantics needs to allow for such non-determinism. To handle this we represent the evaluation of an expression  $e$  to a value  $k$  by the command  $\langle\!\langle e \rangle\!\rangle_k$ . For example, if  $b$  is a boolean expression,  $\langle\!\langle b \rangle\!\rangle_{\text{true}}$  represents evaluating  $b$  to true. If an expression  $e$  does not evaluate to  $k$ ,  $\langle\!\langle e \rangle\!\rangle_k$  is infeasible ( $\perp$ ). Because expression evaluation is side-effect free, successful evaluation corresponds to the command **idle**, which allows finite stuttering transitions during the evaluation.

A constant expression  $\kappa$  only evaluates to  $\kappa$  (36), and a base variable l-value  $v$  only evaluates to  $v$  (37). For unary operators  $\ominus$  and binary operators  $\oplus$ ,  $\hat{\ominus}$  and  $\hat{\oplus}$  represent their standard semantics on values. For a unary operator the sub-expression  $e_1$  is evaluated to  $k_1$ , where there may be multiple values of  $k_1$  that satisfying  $k = \hat{\ominus}k_1$ , or none, in which case the evaluation is infeasible (38). For a predicate  $Pj$ , the notation  $\bigvee_j^{Pj} c j$  represents the non-deterministic choice of  $c j$  over all  $j$  such that  $Pj$  holds. The evaluation of the subexpressions  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  in a binary expression can be done in parallel (39), and similarly for array indexing (41). An array index expression  $lve[e]$  cannot evaluate to a base variable l-value  $v$  (40) but it can evaluate to an array indexed l-value  $A[i]$ , if  $lve$  evaluates to  $A$  and  $e$  evaluates to  $i$  (41). Dereferencing evaluates the l-value  $lve$  to  $lv$



and then dereferences  $lv$  (42). The **idle** at the end ensures that expression evaluation is closed under finite stuttering.

$$\langle \kappa \rangle_k \hat{=} \text{if } k = \kappa \text{ then idle else } \perp \quad (36)$$

$$\langle v \rangle_{lv} \hat{=} \text{if } lv = v \text{ then idle else } \perp \quad (37)$$

$$\langle \ominus e_1 \rangle_k \hat{=} \bigvee_{k_1}^{k=\hat{\ominus}k_1} \langle e_1 \rangle_{k_1} \quad (38)$$

$$\langle e_1 \oplus e_2 \rangle_k \hat{=} \bigvee_{k_1, k_2}^{k=k_1 \hat{\oplus} k_2} (\langle e_1 \rangle_{k_1} \parallel \langle e_2 \rangle_{k_2}) \quad (39)$$

$$\langle lve[e] \rangle_v \hat{=} \perp \quad (40)$$

$$\langle lve[e] \rangle_{A[i]} \hat{=} \llbracket lve \rrbracket_A \parallel \llbracket e \rrbracket_i \quad (41)$$

$$\langle * lve \rangle_k \hat{=} (\bigvee_{lv} \cdot \langle lve \rangle_{lv} ; \tau_{\perp} * lv = k_{\perp} ; \text{idle}) \quad (42)$$

Expressions typically occur in a non-deterministic choice over  $k$ , for example, the only choice that succeeds for  $\langle \kappa \rangle_k$  is for  $k = \kappa$  and all other choices for  $k$  are infeasible. The effect when followed by a command,  $c$ , that is dependent on  $k$ , is to select  $c \kappa$ :

$$\bigvee_k \langle \kappa \rangle_k ; c \kappa = \text{idle} ; c \kappa \vee \perp = \text{idle} ; c \kappa.$$

*Related work.* Most other approaches [24,25,26,35,36,40,12,32,38,39,34,33], employ laws that only apply if expression evaluation is atomic, which does not reflect the reality of expression evaluation in programming language implementations. Such laws can only be used with expressions that have a single critical reference [5, Definition 2.7, p.27]; but the validity of their application in this case cannot be verified within their theories precisely because of the atomicity assumption in their semantics; hence they break the formal chain of reasoning. An exception is the work of Coleman and Jones [6,7] who develop a fine-grained operational semantics that does not assume expression evaluation is atomic, however, the rules they develop are restricted to simple special cases of our rules. Our laws also treat l-value expressions, which allows treatment of array indexing in a manner that does not require a separate assignment command to assign to an array element nor access the whole of an array atomically.  $\square$

**Programming language commands.** A conditional command either evaluates the boolean expression  $b$  to true and executes  $c$ , or to false and executes  $d$  (43). Because our language is not statically typed, the semantics needs to deal with guards that evaluate to a non-boolean, in which case conditionals are defined to abort. Theorem 2 (rely-conditional-spec) below includes an assumption (58) that avoids the case when  $b$  evaluates to a non-boolean. A while loop executes  $c$  while  $b$  evaluates to true and then terminates if  $b$  evaluates to false or aborts if  $b$  evaluates to a non-boolean (44).

$$\text{if } b \text{ then } c \text{ else } d \text{ fi} \hat{=} \langle b \rangle_{\text{true}} ; c \vee \langle b \rangle_{\text{false}} ; d \vee \bigvee_k^{k \notin \mathbb{B}} \langle b \rangle_k ; \top \quad (43)$$

$$\text{while } b \text{ do } c \text{ od} \hat{=} \nu x. \text{ if } b \text{ then } c ; x \text{ else } \tau \text{ fi} \quad (44)$$

### 3 Expression evaluation under interference

Consider the following conditional command,

$$\langle p \rangle ; \text{if } b \text{ do } \langle p_T \rangle ; c \text{ else } \langle p_F \rangle ; d \text{ fi}. \quad (45)$$

In the sequential case [23], assuming the initial state satisfies the precondition  $p$ , the assertions  $p_T$  and  $p_F$  in (45) hold if  $p_T$  is taken to be  $p \cap b$  and  $p_F$  is taken to be  $p \cap \neg b$ . However, under interference from concurrent threads, the following issues arise:

1. the precondition  $p$  may be invalidated by interference;
2. if  $b$  evaluates to true, it does not follow that  $b$  still holds at the start of the **then** branch; and
3. if  $b$  evaluates to false, it does not follow that  $\neg b$  still holds at the start of the **else** branch.

To handle the invalidation of the invariant  $p$  by interference, we require that  $p$  is stable under the rely condition  $r$ . If for a particular example, the precondition  $p$  is not stable under  $r$ , it can be replaced by a weaker precondition that is stable under  $r$ .

**Definition 2 (stable).** *A set of states,  $p$ , is stable under a relation  $r$  if, whenever  $\sigma \in p$  and  $(\sigma, \sigma') \in r$ , then  $\sigma' \in p$ .*

*Related work.* Jones [24] makes use of a property that invariants are preserved by  $r$ , which is similar to stable. Our definition of stability corresponds to that of Xu et al. [40].  $\square$

For reasoning about guard evaluation under interference we make use of a Hoare triple (Definition 1) of the form,  $\{p\} \text{ rely } r \mathrel{\mathcal{M}} \langle b \rangle_k \{p_1\}$ , which can be read as “ $\langle b \rangle_k$  establishes  $p_1$  from initial states satisfying  $p$  under interference satisfying  $r$ ”.

For the conditional command in (45) executing in a context in which its environment satisfies a rely condition  $r$ , the assertions  $p_T$  and  $p_F$  in (45) are valid if the following Hoare triples hold because these triples correspond to evaluating the guard to true/false under interference satisfying  $r$ .

$$\{p\} \text{ rely } r \mathrel{\mathcal{M}} \langle b \rangle_{\text{true}} \{p_T\} \quad (46) \quad \{p\} \text{ rely } r \mathrel{\mathcal{M}} \langle b \rangle_{\text{false}} \{p_F\} \quad (47)$$

These address issues (2) and (3) above.

**Reasoning compositionally about expressions.** Our motivation above focused on boolean expressions but this section presents more general inference rules to show the validity of a Hoare triple of the form,  $\{p\} \text{ rely } r \mathrel{\mathcal{M}} \langle e \rangle_k \{Pk\}$ , for an expression,  $e$ , of any type, where we use  $Pk$  for the postcondition because the postcondition usually depends on  $k$ . Such laws can be used for the boolean guards in conditionals and while loops (see §5) as well as the expressions in assignment commands, including the l-value expressions on their left sides.

To reason about arbitrary expressions, possibly with multiple references to shared variables, we make use of a compositional approach in which we establish a postcondition for a complex expression by first establishing postconditions for each of its component sub-expressions. The approach does not require any syntactic side conditions about the form of an expression and its use of shared variables (see [19] for more details).

**Theorem 1 (expressions).** *For a relation  $r$  and set of states  $p$  that is stable under  $r$ , constants  $\kappa$ ,  $k$ ,  $k_1$  and  $k_2$ , l-value expression  $lve$ , l-values  $lv$  and  $lv_1$ , expressions  $e$ ,  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ , and variable  $v$ ,*

$$\boxed{\text{const}} \{p\} \text{ rely } r \mathrel{\mathcal{M}} \langle \kappa \rangle_k \{p \cap \perp \kappa = k \perp\} \quad (48)$$

$$\boxed{\text{var}} \{p\} \text{ rely } r \bowtie \langle v \rangle_{lv} \{p \cap \perp v = lv \perp\} \quad (49)$$

$$\boxed{\text{deref}} \frac{\begin{array}{c} \{p\} \text{ rely } r \bowtie \langle lve \rangle_{lv} \{P_1 lv\} \\ P_1 lv \cap \perp * lv = k \perp \subseteq Pk, \text{ where } Pk \text{ is stable under } r \end{array}}{\{p\} \text{ rely } r \bowtie \langle * lve \rangle_k \{Pk\}} \quad (50)$$

$$\boxed{\text{unary}} \frac{\begin{array}{c} \forall k_1 . k = \hat{\ominus} k_1 \Rightarrow (\{p\} \text{ rely } r \bowtie \langle e_1 \rangle_{k_1} \{P_1 k_1\}) \wedge \\ P_1 k_1 \subseteq Pk \end{array}}{\{p\} \text{ rely } r \bowtie \langle \ominus e_1 \rangle_k \{Pk\}} \quad (51)$$

$$\boxed{\text{binary}} \frac{\begin{array}{c} \forall k_1 k_2 . k = k_1 \hat{\oplus} k_2 \Rightarrow \{p\} \text{ rely } r \bowtie \langle e_1 \rangle_{k_1} \{P_1 k_1\} \wedge \\ \{p\} \text{ rely } r \bowtie \langle e_2 \rangle_{k_2} \{P_2 k_2\} \wedge \\ P_1 k_1 \cap P_2 k_2 \subseteq Pk \end{array}}{\{p\} \text{ rely } r \bowtie \langle e_1 \oplus e_2 \rangle_k \{Pk\}} \quad (52)$$

$$\boxed{\text{array}} \frac{\begin{array}{c} \forall A k . \{p\} \text{ rely } r \bowtie \langle lve \rangle_A \{P_1 A\} \wedge \\ \{p\} \text{ rely } r \bowtie \langle e \rangle_k \{P_2 k\} \wedge \\ P_1 A \cap P_2 k \subseteq P(A[k]) \end{array}}{\{p\} \text{ rely } r \bowtie \langle lve[e] \rangle_{A[k]} \{P(A[k])\}} \quad (53)$$

**Introducing a conditional command.** A specification command,  $\langle q \rangle$ , being refined to a conditional command (43) must tolerate interference satisfying  $r$  in order to allow for the evaluation of the guard and interference before and after the execution of the conditional.

**Definition 3 (tolerates).** A relation  $q$  tolerates interference  $r$  from precondition  $p$  if  $p$  is stable under  $r$  and both,

$$p \triangleleft (r \circ q) \subseteq q \quad \text{and} \quad p \triangleleft (q \circ r) \subseteq q. \quad (54)$$

If  $q$  tolerates  $r$  from  $p$ , it is shown in [21] that  $p \triangleleft (r^* \circ q \circ r^*) \subseteq q$ , where  $r^*$  is the reflexive, transitive closure of  $r$ . That is,  $q$  tolerates zero or more  $r$  transitions both before and after it, and thus one can introduce **idle** commands before and after a specification command with postcondition  $q$  (see [21] for a proof of this property).

$$\text{rely } r \bowtie \langle p \rangle ; \langle q \rangle = \text{rely } r \bowtie \langle p \rangle ; \text{idle} ; \langle q \rangle ; \text{idle} \quad \text{if } q \text{ tolerates } r \text{ from } p \quad (55)$$

To refine a specification to a conditional command, separate assumptions are required for the case of the guard  $b$  evaluating to true (56) and  $b$  evaluating to false (57). A third assumption (58) ensures  $b$  evaluates to a boolean value, which rules out the third aborting alternative in the definition of a conditional (43) (see [19] for a proof of this theorem).

**Theorem 2 (rely-conditional-spec).** Given a boolean expression  $b$ , relations  $q$  and  $r$ , and sets of states  $p$ ,  $p_T$  and  $p_F$ , if  $q$  tolerates  $r$  from  $p$ , and

$$\{p\} \text{ rely } r \bowtie \langle b \rangle_{\text{true}} \{p_T\} \quad (56) \quad \forall k . \{p\} \text{ rely } r \bowtie \langle b \rangle_k \{ \perp k \in \mathbb{B} \perp \} \quad (58)$$

$$\{p\} \text{ rely } r \bowtie \langle b \rangle_{\text{false}} \{p_F\} \quad (57)$$

then  $\text{rely } r \bowtie \langle p \rangle ; \langle q \rangle \succeq \text{if } b \text{ then } \text{rely } r \bowtie \langle p_T \rangle ; \langle q \rangle \text{ else } \text{rely } r \bowtie \langle p_F \rangle ; \langle q \rangle \text{ fi}$ .

## 4 Recursion

This section develops Theorem 4 (well-founded-recursion-early) that handles introducing recursion. It uses a variant expression  $z$  and a well-founded relation  $\ll$  to show termination. The well-founded induction principle states that for a well-founded relation  $\ll$  and property  $Pk$  defined on values compatible with the type of  $\ll$ ,

$$(\forall k . (\forall j . j \ll k \Rightarrow Pj) \Rightarrow Pk) \Rightarrow (\forall k . Pk). \quad (59)$$

The notation  $\llbracket e_1 \leq e_2 \rrbracket$  abbreviates  $\{\sigma . \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket_\sigma \leq \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket_\sigma\}$  and  $\llbracket e_1 \ll e_2 \rrbracket$  abbreviates  $\{\sigma . \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket_\sigma \ll \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket_\sigma\}$ , where  $\llbracket e \rrbracket_\sigma$  is the value of  $e$  in state  $\sigma$ . The following lemma lifts well-founded induction to reasoning about refinement of commands using a variant expression  $z$  compatible with a well-founded relation  $\ll$ .

**Lemma 3** (well-founded-variant). *For commands  $s$  and  $c$ , a well-founded relation  $\ll$ , and a variant expression  $z$  that is compatible with the type of  $\ll$ , if*

$$\forall k . (\llbracket \llbracket z \rrbracket \ll k \rrbracket ; s \succeq c) \Rightarrow (\llbracket \llbracket z \rrbracket = k \rrbracket ; s \succeq c) \quad (60)$$

*then  $s \succeq c$ . A proof may be found in Appendix A.*

Theorem 4 applies Lemma 3 for  $c$  in the form of the greatest fixed point,  $\nu f$ , of a monotone function  $f$  on commands. It is assumed that from states satisfying  $p_X$ ,  $f$  does not make any recursive calls, as encoded here by using the parameter  $\top$ , which allows any behaviour if the parameter is used within the body of  $f$ .

**Theorem 4 (well-founded-recursion-early).** *For a set of states  $p_X$ , a well-founded relation  $\ll$ , a variant expression  $z$  that is compatible with the type of  $\ll$ , a command  $s$ , and a monotone function  $f$ , if*

$$\llbracket p_X \rrbracket ; s \succeq f \top \quad (61)$$

$$\forall k . \llbracket \llbracket z \rrbracket = k \rrbracket ; s \succeq f(\llbracket \llbracket z \rrbracket \ll k \rrbracket \cup p_X) ; s \quad (62)$$

*then,  $s \succeq \nu f$ . A proof may be found in Appendix A.*

The proviso (61) is used to handle the case in which  $p_X$  holding initially ensures  $\nu f$  does not utilise any recursive calls, e.g. taking  $f$  to be  $(\lambda x . \text{if } b \text{ then } c ; x \text{ else } \tau \text{ fi})$ , the case in which the guard  $b$  is guaranteed to evaluate to false if  $p_X$  holds. A special case is if  $p_X$  is the empty set, in which case (61) is trivially satisfied and (62) is simplified.


*Related work.* Schellhorn et al. [34] include recursion in their approach. Sanán et al. [33] allow parameterless procedures and make use of a natural number called depth bound to avoid infinite recursion. Other approaches [6,12,32,39,40] do not consider recursion, instead they define the semantics of while loops via an operational semantics, as do Sanán et al. [33].  $\square$

## 5 Introducing a while loop

For a while loop we would like to derive a law to establish,

$$\text{rely } r \models \llbracket p \rrbracket ; \llbracket q^* \triangleright p_F \rrbracket \succeq \text{while } b \text{ do } c \text{ od} . \quad (63)$$

The while loop should establish the relation  $q^*$ , between its initial and final states and terminate in a state satisfying  $p_F$ . The precondition  $p$  is also the loop invariant. To show termination we use a variant expression  $z$ , that is required to strictly decrease according to a well-founded relation  $\ll$  on each iteration, unless an iteration establishes an early termination condition  $p_X$  that guarantees the loop guard will evaluate to false and hence the loop will exit. The variant expression  $z$  may not be increased by interference from concurrent threads (64).



Because the definition of a while loop is based on a conditional command, the law for introducing a while loop inherits the assumptions that evaluating the loop guard  $b$  to true from states satisfying  $p$  under interference satisfying  $r$  establishes  $p_T$  (65), and similarly, evaluating  $b$  to false establishes  $p_F$  (66), and that the guard must evaluate to a boolean (67). If  $b$  is guaranteed not to evaluate to true from states satisfying  $p_X \cap p$ , the guard evaluation  $\langle b \rangle_{\text{true}}$  is infeasible and hence establishes  $\emptyset$  (68). From initial states satisfying  $p_T$  and that the variant  $z$  is less than or equal to  $k$ , the body of the loop  $c$  must establish  $q^*$  between its pre and post states, and its post state must re-establish the invariant  $p$  and either strictly decrease the variant  $z$  or establish  $p_X$ , from which the loop is guaranteed to terminate (69). The bound variable  $k$  can be thought of as the value of  $z$  before guard evaluation; after guard evaluation only  $z \leq k$  can be assumed because interference may have decreased  $z$ .

**Theorem 5 (intro-while).** *Given a boolean expression  $b$ , a relation  $r$ , sets of states  $p$ ,  $p_T$ ,  $p_F$  and  $p_X$ , a transitive, well-founded relation  $\ll$  with reflexive closure  $\leq$ , a variant expression  $z$  that is compatible with the type of  $\ll$ , and a relation  $q$  such that  $q^*$  tolerates  $r$  from  $p$ , if,*

$$r \subseteq \lceil z' \leq z \rceil \quad (64)$$

$$\{p\} \text{ rely } r \models \langle b \rangle_{\text{true}} \{p_T\} \quad (65)$$

$$\{p\} \text{ rely } r \models \langle b \rangle_{\text{false}} \{p_F\} \quad (66)$$

$$\forall k . \{p\} \text{ rely } r \models \langle b \rangle_k \{ \perp k \in \mathbb{B} \} \quad (67)$$

$$\{p_X \cap p\} \text{ rely } r \models \langle b \rangle_{\text{true}} \{\emptyset\} \quad (68)$$

$$\forall k . \text{ rely } r \models \llbracket p_T \cap \perp z \leq k \rrbracket ; \llbracket q^* \triangleright ((\perp z \ll k \sqcup p_X) \cap p) \rrbracket \succeq c \quad (69)$$

then  $\text{rely } r \models \llbracket p \rrbracket ; \llbracket q^* \triangleright p_F \rrbracket \succeq \text{while } b \text{ do } c \text{ od}$ . A proof may be found in Appendix A.

*Related work.* Our approach differs from earlier approaches [12,32,39,40,34,33] in that our treatment of expression evaluation is fine-grained. We also make use of an early

exit version of the while loop rule to allow for the case when it is the interference that decreases the variant expression because in this case the body of the loop may not be able to decrease the variant. The early exit version of the rule is required for reasoning about the *remove* example and is not derivable from the non-early-exit version.  $\square$

**Fair termination** The command  $\mathbf{fair} \triangleq (\epsilon^* ; \pi)^\omega ; \epsilon^*$  disallows an infinite contiguous sequence of environment transitions [18]. Fair execution of a command  $c$  can be represented as  $c \mathbin{\text{\textcircled{f}}} \mathbf{fair}$ , which rules out an infinite contiguous sequence of environment transitions when executing  $c$ , unless  $c$  aborts. The command  $\mathbf{term}$  allows only a finite number of program transitions but does not rule out an infinite contiguous sequence of environment transitions, however,  $\mathbf{term} \mathbin{\text{\textcircled{f}}} \mathbf{fair} = \alpha^*$  and hence allows only a finite number of transitions. Thus if a command  $c$  refines  $\mathbf{term}$ , then  $c \mathbin{\text{\textcircled{f}}} \mathbf{fair}$  only performs a finite number of transitions, i.e.  $c \mathbin{\text{\textcircled{f}}} \mathbf{fair} \preceq \mathbf{term} \mathbin{\text{\textcircled{f}}} \mathbf{fair} = \alpha^*$ . Hence it is sufficient to show that a command  $c$  refines  $\mathbf{term}$  in order to show fair execution of  $c$  only makes a finite number of transitions. The reader is referred to [18] for a more thorough treatment of fairness in our theory.

*Related work.* Dingel [12] handles fairness by defining the trace semantics of his parallel operator to only allow fair interleaving. Because the semantics of Schellhorn et al. [34] explicitly alternates between a program transition and an environment transition (corresponding to any number of our environment transitions), it implicitly corresponds to fair execution. Our approach allows one to decouple fair execution and allows a simpler definition of the parallel operator [18].  $\square$

## 6 Example: Remove an element from a set

Theorem 5 (intro-while) can be applied to show that the *remove* specification (2) is refined by the while loop (3). The loop invariant  $p$  is just that the types of  $i$  and  $w$  are valid  $\lfloor i \in 0..63 \wedge *w \subseteq 0..63 \rfloor$ . Because *sample* is a local variable [28], it is not subject to interference, and hence the rely condition in specification (2) can be augmented with  $\lceil *sample' = *sample \rceil$  to give a rely condition of  $\lceil *w' \subseteq *w \wedge *sample' = *sample \rceil$ . The postcondition  $q$  is just the universal relation, which is reflexive and transitive. The set of states  $p_T$  is just  $p$ , and  $p_F$  and  $p_X$  are both  $\lfloor i \notin *w \rfloor$ . The variant expression is the finite set  $*w$  under the well-founded subset ordering ( $\subset$ ). The body of the loop,  $c$ , is  $sample := *w ; CAS(w, *sample, *sample - \{i\})$ . The proof obligations are:

$$r \subseteq \lceil *w' \subseteq *w \rceil \quad (70)$$

$$\{p\} \text{ rely } r \mathbin{\text{\textcircled{f}}} \langle i \in *w \rangle_{\text{true}} \{p\} \quad (71)$$

$$\{p\} \text{ rely } r \mathbin{\text{\textcircled{f}}} \langle i \in *w \rangle_{\text{false}} \{\lfloor i \notin *w \rfloor\} \quad (72)$$

$$\forall k . \{p\} \text{ rely } r \mathbin{\text{\textcircled{f}}} \langle i \in *w \rangle_k \{\lfloor k \in \mathbb{B} \rfloor\} \quad (73)$$

$$\{\lfloor i \notin *w \rfloor \cap p\} \text{ rely } r \mathbin{\text{\textcircled{f}}} \langle i \in *w \rangle_{\text{true}} \{\emptyset\} \quad (74)$$

$$\forall k . \text{ rely } r \mathbin{\text{\textcircled{f}}} \langle p \cap \lfloor *w \subseteq k \rfloor \rangle ; (\text{univ} \triangleright (\lfloor *w \subset k \vee i \notin *w \rfloor \cap p)) \succeq c \quad (75)$$

Proof obligation (70) is trivial and (71) holds because  $p$  is stable under  $r$ . For (72), evaluating  $i \in *w$  to false establishes  $i \notin *w$  because the latter is stable under the rely

condition that elements are only ever removed from  $*w$ . Obligation (73) holds because the type invariant on  $i$  and  $*w$  ensures that the guard  $i \in *w$  only ever evaluates to a boolean. For (74), the precondition  $i \notin *w$  is stable under the rely and hence the evaluation of  $\langle i \in *w \rangle_{\text{true}}$  is infeasible and hence establishes  $\emptyset$ . We have not treated the rule for an assignment command or the atomic specification for the CAS in this paper but the assignment  $\text{sample} := *w$  with a precondition of  $\lfloor *w \subseteq k \rfloor$  establishes the postcondition  $\lfloor *w \subseteq *\text{sample} \subseteq k \rfloor$ , which is stable under the rely. Under that precondition, the CAS either (a) succeeds if  $*\text{sample} = *w$  and removes  $i$  from  $*w$  establishing  $\lfloor i \notin *w \rfloor$ , or (b) fails if  $*\text{sample} \neq *w$  and hence due to the pre and rely conditions,  $\lfloor *w \subseteq k \rfloor$  holds. In either case the type invariant  $p$  is preserved.

Theorem 5 does not consider the guarantee  $\ulcorner *w - *w' \subseteq \{i\} \wedge *w' \subseteq *w \urcorner$ , which is reflexive. Elsewhere we have shown that reflexive guarantees can be distributed into a while loop [29]. The guarantee is satisfied by the loop body because  $i$  is a constant and the only place  $*w$  is modified is by the CAS, which only succeeds if  $*\text{sample} = *w$  and hence replaces  $*w$  by  $*w - \{i\}$ , which satisfies the guarantee. The other code and a failing execution of the CAS do not modify  $*w$  and hence satisfy the guarantee because  $*w - *w' = \emptyset \subseteq \{i\}$ .

Because we have shown that specification (2) is refined by (3), and because any postcondition specification command refines **term** by (32), we can conclude from §5 that fair execution of the while loop (3) in an environment satisfying precondition  $p$  and rely condition  $r$ , will only make a finite number of transitions.

## 7 Conclusion

The main contributions of this work are to provide general laws for reasoning about recursion and while loops, including termination arguments based on a variant and a well-founded relation, both in the context of interference from concurrent threads. Our laws are early termination versions because these more general rules are required in the context of concurrency. We do not assume either expressions or assignment commands are atomic but use a fine-grained definition of expressions along with a set of inference rules that allow compositional reasoning about expressions, including guards. In our approach l-values can be either base variables or indexed arrays. Importantly, evaluation of the l-value for an indexed array is done before dereferencing its value, so that atomicity is only required for accessing individual array elements, not the whole array. The concurrency theory used in this paper has been formalised within the Isabelle/HOL theorem prover [31], and the results presented in this paper have been verified in that theory.

*Acknowledgements.* Our joint work was supported by the Australian Research Council (ARC) under their Discovery Program Grant DP190102142. Hayes and Meinicke were also supported by funding from the Department of Defence, administered through the Advanced Strategic Capabilities Accelerator grant *Verifying Concurrent Data Structures for Trustworthy Systems*. Jones was supported by Leverhulme Trust RPG-2019-020 and would like to acknowledge the stimulus of the *Big Specification* programme at the Cambridge Isaac Newton Institute.

## References

1. P. H. G. Aczel. On an inference rule for parallel composition, 1983. Private communication to Cliff Jones. URL: <http://homepages.cs.ncl.ac.uk/cliff.jones/publications/MSS/PHGA-traces.pdf>.
2. R.-J. R. Back and J. von Wright. *Refinement Calculus: A Systematic Introduction*. Springer, New York, 1998.
3. R.-J. R. Back and J. von Wright. Reasoning algebraically about loops. *Acta Informatica*, 36:295–334, 1999.
4. F.L. Bauer, M. Broy, R. Gnatz, W. Hesse, and B. Krieg-Brückner. A wide spectrum language for program development. In *3rd Int. Symp. Programming, Paris*, pages 1–15, 1978.
5. M. Ben-Ari. *Principles of Concurrent and Distributed Programming*. Addison Wesley, second edition, 2005.
6. J. W. Coleman and C. B. Jones. A structural proof of the soundness of rely/guarantee rules. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 17(4):807–841, 2007.
7. Joseph William Coleman. *Constructing a Tractable Reasoning Framework upon a Fine-Grained Structural Operational Semantics*. PhD thesis, Newcastle University, January 2008.
8. R. J. Colvin, I. J. Hayes, and L. A. Meinicke. Designing a semantic model for a wide-spectrum language with concurrency. *Formal Aspects of Computing*, 29:853–875, 2017. doi:10.1007/s00165-017-0416-4.
9. W.-P. de Roever. *Concurrency Verification: Introduction to Compositional and Noncompositional Methods*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.
10. E. W. Dijkstra. Guarded commands, nondeterminacy, and a formal derivation of programs. *CACM*, 18:453–458, 1975.
11. E. W. Dijkstra. *A Discipline of Programming*. Prentice-Hall, 1976.
12. J. Dingel. A refinement calculus for shared-variable parallel and distributed programming. *Formal Aspects of Computing*, 14(2):123–197, 2002.
13. Julian Fell, Ian J. Hayes, and Andrius Velykis. Concurrent refinement algebra and rely quotients. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, December 2016. [http://isa-afp.org/entries/Concurrent\\_Ref\\_Alg.shtml](http://isa-afp.org/entries/Concurrent_Ref_Alg.shtml).
14. David Gries. *The Science of Programming*. Springer-Verlag, 1981.
15. I. J. Hayes. Generalised rely-guarantee concurrency: An algebraic foundation. *Formal Aspects of Computing*, 28(6):1057–1078, November 2016. doi:10.1007/s00165-016-0384-0.
16. I. J. Hayes, R. J. Colvin, L. A. Meinicke, K. Winter, and A. Velykis. An algebra of synchronous atomic steps. In J. Fitzgerald, C. Heitmeyer, S. Gnesi, and A. Philippou, editors, *FM 2016: Formal Methods: 21st International Symposium, Proceedings*, volume 9995 of *LNCS*, pages 352–369, Cham, November 2016. Springer International Publishing. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-48989-6\_22.
17. I. J. Hayes and C. B. Jones. A guide to rely/guarantee thinking. In J. P. Bowen, Z. Liu, and Z. Zhang, editors, *Engineering Trustworthy Software Systems*, volume 11174 of *LNCS*, pages 1–38. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2018. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-02928-9\_1.
18. I. J. Hayes and L. A. Meinicke. Encoding fairness in a synchronous concurrent program algebra. In Klaus Havelund, Jan Peleska, Bill Roscoe, and Erik de Vink, editors, *Formal Methods*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 222–239, Cham, July 2018. Springer International Publishing.
19. Ian J. Hayes, Cliff B. Jones, and Larissa A. Meinicke. Reasoning about expression evaluation under interference, 2025. (under review for Formal Aspects of Computing, current draft available at arXiv:2409.07741 [cs.LO]).



20. Ian J. Hayes, Larissa A. Meinicke, and Naso Evangelou-Oost. Restructuring a concurrent refinement algebra. In Uli Fahrenberg, Wesley Fussner, and Roland Glück, editors, *Relational and Algebraic Methods in Computer Science*, volume 14787 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 135–155, Cham, 2024. Springer Nature Switzerland. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-68279-7\_9.
21. Ian J. Hayes, Larissa A. Meinicke, and Patrick A. Meiring. Deriving laws for developing concurrent programs in a rely-guarantee style, 2021. arXiv:2103.15292, doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2103.15292.
22. Ian J. Hayes, Larissa A. Meinicke, Kirsten Winter, and Robert J. Colvin. A synchronous program algebra: a basis for reasoning about shared-memory and event-based concurrency. *Formal Aspects of Computing*, 31(2):133–163, April 2019. doi:10.1007/s00165-018-0464-4.
23. C. A. R. Hoare. An axiomatic basis for computer programming. *Communications of the ACM*, 12(10):576–580, 583, October 1969. doi:10.1145/363235.363259.
24. C. B. Jones. *Development Methods for Computer Programs including a Notion of Interference*. PhD thesis, Oxford University, June 1981. Available as: Oxford University Computing Laboratory (now Computer Science) Technical Monograph PRG-25. URL: <https://www.cs.ox.ac.uk/files/9025/PRG-25.pdf>.
25. C. B. Jones. Specification and design of (parallel) programs. In *Proceedings of IFIP’83*, pages 321–332. North-Holland, 1983.
26. C. B. Jones. Tentative steps toward a development method for interfering programs. *ACM ToPLaS*, 5(4):596–619, 1983. doi:10.1145/69575.69577.
27. C. B. Jones. *Systematic Software Development using VDM*. Prentice Hall International, second edition, 1990. URL: <http://homepages.cs.ncl.ac.uk/cliff.jones/ftp-stuff/Jones1990.pdf>.
28. Larissa A. Meinicke and Ian J. Hayes. Using cylindric algebra to support local variables in rely/guarantee concurrency. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 11th International Conference on Formal Methods in Software Engineering (FormalISE)*, pages 108–119. IEEE, 2023. doi:10.1109/FormalISE58978.2023.00019.
29. Larissa A. Meinicke and Ian J. Hayes. Reasoning about distributive laws in a concurrent refinement algebra. In A. Cavalcanti and J. Baxter, editors, *The Practice of Formal Methods: Essays in Honour of Cliff Jones, Part II*, volume 14781 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–22, Cham, 2024. Springer Nature Switzerland. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-66673-5\_1.
30. C. C. Morgan. *Programming from Specifications*. Prentice Hall, second edition, 1994.
31. T. Nipkow, L. C. Paulson, and M. Wenzel. *Isabelle/HOL: A Proof Assistant for Higher-Order Logic*, volume 2283 of *LNCS*. Springer, 2002.
32. Leonor Prensa Nieto. The rely-guarantee method in Isabelle/HOL. In *Proceedings of ESOP 2003*, volume 2618 of *LNCS*. Springer-Verlag, 2003.
33. David Sanan, Yongwang Zhao, Shang-Wei Lin, and Liu Yang. CSim<sup>2</sup>: Compositional top-down verification of concurrent systems using rely-guarantee. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems*, 43(1), January 2021.
34. G. Schellhorn, B. Tofan, G. Ernst, J. Pfähler, and W. Reif. RGITL: A temporal logic framework for compositional reasoning about interleaved programs. *Ann. Math. Artif. Intell.*, 71(1-3):131–174, 2014. doi:10.1007/s10472-013-9389-z.
35. K. Stølen. *Development of Parallel Programs on Shared Data-Structures*. PhD thesis, Manchester University, 1990. Published as technical report UMCS-91-1-1, now available on-line <https://breibakk.no/kst/PhD-thesis.htm>. URL: <https://breibakk.no/kst/PhD-thesis.htm>.
36. Ketil Stølen. A method for the development of totally correct shared-state parallel programs. In *CONCUR’91*, pages 510–525. Springer, 1991.

37. J. von Wright. Towards a refinement algebra. *Science of Computer Programming*, 51:23–45, 2004.
38. J. Wickerson, M. Dodds, and M. J. Parkinson. Explicit stabilisation for modular rely-guarantee reasoning. Technical Report 774, Computer Laboratory, University of Cambridge, March 2010. Extended technical report version of [39].
39. J. Wickerson, M. Dodds, and M. J. Parkinson. Explicit stabilisation for modular rely-guarantee reasoning. In A. D. Gordon, editor, *ESOP*, volume 6012 of *LNCS*, pages 610–629. Springer, 2010.
40. Qiwen Xu, Willem-Paul de Roever, and Jifeng He. The rely-guarantee method for verifying concurrent programs. *Formal Aspects of Computing*, 9:149–174, 1997.

## A Proofs

**Lemma 3 (well-founded-variant).** *For commands  $s$  and  $c$ , a well-founded relation  $\ll$ , and a variant expression  $z$  that is compatible with the type of  $\ll$ , if,*

$$\forall k . (\ll z \ll k \rrbracket ; s \succeq c) \Rightarrow (\ll z = k \rrbracket ; s \succeq c) \quad (76)$$

*then  $s \succeq c$ .*

*Proof.* The antecedent of well-founded induction (59) with  $Pk$  as  $\ll z = k \rrbracket ; s \succeq c$  holds if for all  $k$ ,  $\forall j . j \ll k \Rightarrow \ll z = j \rrbracket ; s \succeq c \Rightarrow \ll z = k \rrbracket ; s \succeq c$ , which holds as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \forall j . j \ll k \Rightarrow \ll z = j \rrbracket ; s \succeq c \\
 \Rightarrow & \text{by (20) with } P = \{ \ll z = j \rrbracket \mid j . j \ll k \} \\
 & \ll \bigcup \{ \ll z = j \rrbracket \mid j . j \ll k \} \rrbracket ; s \succeq c \\
 \equiv & \text{as } \bigcup \{ \ll z = j \rrbracket \mid j . j \ll k \} = \ll z \ll k \rrbracket \\
 & \ll z \ll k \rrbracket ; s \succeq c \\
 \Rightarrow & \text{by assumption (76)} \\
 & \ll z = k \rrbracket ; s \succeq c
 \end{aligned}$$

and hence by well-founded induction (59) as  $\ll$  is well founded,  $\forall k . \ll z = k \rrbracket ; s \succeq c$ , and hence by (20)  $\ll \bigcup_k \ll z = k \rrbracket \rrbracket ; s \succeq c$ , and hence as  $\bigcup_k \ll z = k \rrbracket = \Sigma$ , we have  $s \succeq c$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4 (well-founded-recursion-early).** *For a set of states  $p_X$ , a well-founded relation  $\ll$ , a variant expression  $z$  that is compatible with the type of  $\ll$ , a command  $s$ , and a monotone function  $f$ , if*

$$\ll p_X \rrbracket ; s \succeq f \top \quad (77)$$

$$\forall k . \ll z = k \rrbracket ; s \succeq f(\ll z \ll k \rrbracket \cup p_X \rrbracket ; s) \quad (78)$$

*then,  $s \succeq \nu f$ .*

*Proof.* For the early termination case we have  $\llbracket p_X \rrbracket ; s \succeq \nu f$  as follows, using (77) with the facts that  $f$  is monotone,  $\top$  is the greatest element, and  $\nu f$  is a fixed point of  $f$ :

$$\llbracket p_X \rrbracket ; s \succeq f \top \succeq f(\nu f) = \nu f. \quad (79)$$

By Lemma 3 (well-founded-variant) to show  $s \succeq \nu f$ , it suffices to show,

$$\forall k. (\llbracket \text{LZ} \ll k \rrbracket ; s \succeq \nu f) \Rightarrow (\llbracket \text{LZ} = k \rrbracket ; s \succeq \nu f).$$

To show this for any  $k$ , assume

$$\llbracket \text{LZ} \ll k \rrbracket ; s \succeq \nu f \quad (80)$$

and show  $\llbracket \text{LZ} = k \rrbracket ; s \succeq \nu f$  as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket \text{LZ} = k \rrbracket ; s \\ & \succeq \text{by (78)} \\ & f(\llbracket \text{LZ} \ll k \rrbracket \cup p_X \rrbracket ; s) \\ & \succeq \text{by (19) using (80) and (79) and } f \text{ is monotone} \\ & f(\nu f) \\ & = \text{folding fixed point} \\ & \nu f. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

**Theorem 5 (intro-while).** Given a boolean expression  $b$ , a relation  $r$ , sets of states  $p$ ,  $p_T$ ,  $p_F$  and  $p_X$ , a transitive, well-founded relation  $\ll$  with reflexive closure  $\leq$ , a variant expression  $z$  that is compatible with the type of  $\ll$ , and a relation  $q$  such that  $q^*$  tolerates  $r$  from  $p$ , if,

$$r \subseteq \lceil z' \leq z \rceil \quad (81)$$

$$\{p\} \text{ rely } r \models \langle b \rangle_{\text{true}} \{p_T\} \quad (82)$$

$$\{p\} \text{ rely } r \models \langle b \rangle_{\text{false}} \{p_F\} \quad (83)$$

$$\forall k. \{p\} \text{ rely } r \models \langle b \rangle_k \{ \llbracket \text{LZ} \in \mathbb{B} \rrbracket \} \quad (84)$$

$$\{p_X \cap p\} \text{ rely } r \models \langle b \rangle_{\text{true}} \{\emptyset\} \quad (85)$$

$$\forall k. \text{ rely } r \models \llbracket p_T \cap \text{LZ} \leq k \rrbracket ; \langle q^* \triangleright ((\text{LZ} \ll k \rrbracket \cup p_X) \cap p) \rrbracket \succeq c \quad (86)$$

then  $\text{rely } r \models \llbracket p \rrbracket ; \langle q^* \triangleright p_F \rangle \succeq \text{while } b \text{ do } c \text{ od}.$

*Proof.* Because a while loop is defined as a greatest fixed point of the monotone function  $(\lambda x. \text{if } b \text{ then } c ; x \text{ else } \tau \text{ fi})$ , we make use of Theorem 4 (well-founded-recursion-early) to prove the law. The provisos for Theorem 4 in this case are the following.

$$\llbracket p_X \rrbracket ; (\text{rely } r \models \llbracket p \rrbracket ; \langle q^* \triangleright p_F \rangle) \succeq \text{if } b \text{ then } c ; \top \text{ else } \tau \text{ fi} \quad (87)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \forall k. \llbracket \text{LZ} = k \rrbracket ; (\text{rely } r \models \llbracket p \rrbracket ; \langle q^* \triangleright p_F \rangle) & \succeq \text{if } b \text{ then } c ; \llbracket \text{LZ} \ll k \rrbracket \cup p_X \rrbracket ; \\ & (\text{rely } r \models \llbracket p \rrbracket ; \langle q^* \triangleright p_F \rangle) \text{ else } \tau \text{ fi} \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

The left side of (87) is equivalent to  $\text{rely } r \sqcap \llbracket p_X \cap p \rrbracket ; \langle q^* \triangleright p_F \rangle$  and hence to show the refinement we can use Theorem 2 (rely-conditional-spec) with the proof obligations:

$$q^* \text{ tolerates } r \text{ from } p \quad (89)$$

$$\{p_X \cap p\} \text{ rely } r \sqcap \langle b \rangle_{\text{true}} \{\emptyset\} \quad (90)$$

$$\{p_X \cap p\} \text{ rely } r \sqcap \langle b \rangle_{\text{false}} \{p_F\} \quad (91)$$

$$\forall k . \{p_X \cap p\} \text{ rely } r \sqcap \langle b \rangle_k \{\llcorner k \in \mathbb{B} \lrcorner\} \quad (92)$$

and then show the refinement of the **then** and **else** branches of the conditional,

$$\text{rely } r \sqcap \langle \emptyset \rangle ; \langle q^* \triangleright p_F \rangle \succeq c ; \top \quad (93)$$

$$\text{rely } r \sqcap \langle p_F \rangle ; \langle q^* \triangleright p_F \rangle \succeq \tau \quad (94)$$

The relation  $q^*$  tolerates  $r$  from  $p$  (89) by assumption. Property (90) is just assumption (85), (91) follows from assumption (83), similarly, (92) follows from (84). Property (93) holds because  $\langle \emptyset \rangle = \top$  and hence the left side reduces to  $\top$ , which is refined by any other command. Property (94) holds because relation  $q^*$  is reflexive and hence  $\langle q^* \rangle \succeq \langle \text{id} \rangle \succeq \tau$  and hence  $\text{rely } r \sqcap \langle p_F \rangle ; \langle q^* \triangleright p_F \rangle \succeq \langle p_F \rangle ; \langle q^* \rangle ; \tau p_F \succeq \langle p_F \rangle ; \tau p_F = \langle p_F \rangle \succeq \tau$  by (18).

The left side of (88) is refined by  $\text{rely } r \sqcap \llbracket \llcorner z \leq k \lrcorner \cap p \rrbracket ; \langle q^* \triangleright p_F \rangle$  and hence to show the refinement we can use Theorem 2 (rely-conditional-spec) with the proof obligations:

$$q^* \text{ tolerates } r \text{ from } p \quad (95)$$

$$\{\llcorner z \leq k \lrcorner \cap p\} \text{ rely } r \sqcap \langle b \rangle_{\text{true}} \{p_T \cap \llcorner z \leq k \lrcorner\} \quad (96)$$

$$\{\llcorner z \leq k \lrcorner \cap p\} \text{ rely } r \sqcap \langle b \rangle_{\text{false}} \{p_F\} \quad (97)$$

$$\forall k . \{\llcorner z \leq k \lrcorner \cap p\} \text{ rely } r \sqcap \langle b \rangle_k \{\llcorner k \in \mathbb{B} \lrcorner\} \quad (98)$$

and then show the refinement of the **then** and **else** branches of the conditional,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rely } r \sqcap \llbracket p_T \cap \llcorner z \leq k \lrcorner \rrbracket ; \langle q^* \triangleright p_F \rangle \succeq c ; \llbracket \llcorner z < k \lrcorner \cup p_X \rrbracket ; \\ (\text{rely } r \sqcap \langle p \rangle ; \langle q^* \triangleright p_F \rangle) \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

$$\text{rely } r \sqcap \langle p_F \rangle ; \langle q^* \triangleright p_F \rangle \succeq \tau \quad (100)$$

Property (95) holds by assumption. Property (96) holds by assumptions (82) and (81), where (81) ensures that  $\llcorner z \leq k \lrcorner$  is stable under the rely  $r$  and hence holds after the guard evaluation. Properties (97) and (98) follow from assumptions (83) and (84), respectively. Property (100) is the same as (94) that was shown above. Property (99) holds as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{rely } r \sqcap \llbracket p_T \cap \llcorner z \leq k \lrcorner \rrbracket ; \langle q^* \triangleright p_F \rangle \\ = & \text{ applying (33) to pull out the final test and as } q^* \text{ is transitive, } q^* = q^* \circ q^* \\ & \text{rely } r \sqcap \llbracket p_T \cap \llcorner z \leq k \lrcorner \rrbracket ; \langle q^* \circ q^* \rangle ; \tau p_F \\ \succeq & \text{ using (34) to split } \langle q^* \circ q^* \rangle \text{ and introduce assertion } (\llcorner z < k \lrcorner \cup p_X) \cap p \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{rely } r \models \{p_T \cap \textcolor{blue}{LZ} \leq \textcolor{blue}{k}_\perp\} ; \langle q^* \triangleright ((\textcolor{blue}{LZ} \ll \textcolor{blue}{k}_\perp \cup p_X) \cap p) \rangle ; \\
& \{(\textcolor{blue}{LZ} \ll \textcolor{blue}{k}_\perp \cup p_X) \cap p\} ; \langle q^* \rangle ; \tau p_F \\
= & \text{distribute the rely over the sequential composition (35)} \\
& (\text{rely } r \models \{p_T \cap \textcolor{blue}{LZ} \leq \textcolor{blue}{k}_\perp\} ; \langle q^* \triangleright ((\textcolor{blue}{LZ} \ll \textcolor{blue}{k}_\perp \cup p_X) \cap p) \rangle); \\
& (\text{rely } r \models \{(\textcolor{blue}{LZ} \ll \textcolor{blue}{k}_\perp \cup p_X) \cap p\} ; \langle q^* \rangle ; \tau p_F) \\
\geq & \text{apply assumption (86) to introduce } c \\
& c ; (\text{rely } r \models \{(\textcolor{blue}{LZ} \ll \textcolor{blue}{k}_\perp \cup p_X) \cap p\} ; \langle q^* \rangle ; \tau p_F) \\
= & \text{split assertion (17) and pull out the first assertion; apply (33) in reverse} \\
& c ; \{ \textcolor{blue}{LZ} \ll \textcolor{blue}{k}_\perp \cup p_X \} ; (\text{rely } r \models \{p\} ; \langle q^* \triangleright p_F \rangle)
\end{aligned}$$

□